

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/961,403	Applicant(s) HESS-STUMPP ET AL.	
	Examiner Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ethan Whisenant, Ph.D. (3) _____

(2) Robert McCarthy. (4) _____

Date of Interview: week of 23 MAR 03 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: _____ .

Identification of prior art discussed: _____ .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In response to a telephonic inquiry, the applicant's representative informed the examiner that the Office action mailed 02 JAN 03 had not been received. The examiner agreed to remail the action and restart the time period for response. .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required